

<sup>43</sup>  
126. An information processing apparatus according  
to claim <sup>42</sup>125, wherein said data items are displayed with a  
plurality of stepped sizes according to distances of linkages  
among a plurality of levels.

<sup>12</sup>  
A 127. An information processing apparatus according  
to claim 125, wherein said data items represent time-series  
data accumulated time-sequentially <sup>B</sup>and are displayed by  
regarding an interval of time as the distance of a linkage.

<sup>44</sup>  
128. An information processing apparatus according  
to claim <sup>42</sup>125, wherein said data items represent hierarchical  
data managed hierarchically and are displayed by regarding a  
depth in a hierarchy as the distance of a linkage.--

#### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5-35, 110-116 and 125-128 are now  
presented for examination. Claims 1, 3, 5-8, 11, 21-26, 28,  
30-35 and 110-116 have been amended to define still more  
clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 2,  
4, 36-109 and 117-124 have been cancelled without prejudice  
or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 125-128 have been  
added provide Applicants with a more complete scope of  
protection. The title has been amended to make it more  
descriptive, as required in the Office Action. The  
specification and abstract have been carefully reviewed and

amended as to matters of form, including those kindly pointed out in the Office Action. The drawing objections noted in the form PTO-948 attached to the Office Action will be tended to at such time as this application may be passed to issue.

Claims 1, 5, 21, 22, 35, 110, 112, 115 and 125 are independent.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,555,354 (Strasnick et al.), and Claims 3, 5-35 and 112-116 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious from that patent.

Applicants wish to point out that Claim 110 has been amended so that it now corresponds to elected Claim 1 and request that amended Claims 110 and 111 be examined on the merits in this application.

As shown above, the independent claims have been amended to recite Applicants' invention more clearly. Applicants submit that the independent claims, including those newly added, are patentable over the prior art for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claims 1, 110 and 125 recite, inter alia, that data items included within a similar level of linkage position are displayed simultaneously in substantially the same size, and that first data items, and second data items linked to the first data items, which are not included within the similar level of linkage position,

are display mutually distinguishably in different sizes determined according to the distance of the linkage.

This aspect of the present invention is supported at least by Fig. 3, in which 8 images on ring 3a or 3b correspond to data items included within a similar level of linkage position, and a relation between 8 images on ring 3a and 8 image on ring 3b corresponds to that of first data items, and second data items linked to said first data items, which are not included within the similar level of linkage position.

As understood by Applicants, Strasnick shows, in Figs. 1, 2A and 2B, that data items having a hierarchical structure are displayed on a screen so that linkages of data items in the hierarchical structure may be recognized.

The Office Action states that the zoom feature of Strasnick distinguishes the size between close and distant data, where distance is associated with the linkage.

However, the display size in the zoom feature of Strasnick only depends on how close or distant from data of interest a display position of data is, not on whether or not the level of linkage position is similar.

For example, it is apparent from Fig. 2A of Strasnick that data items, such as the America cell or the Asia cell, having the level of linkage position similar to the Europe cell 200 are not displayed on a screen. Further, on zooming to a country's cell in Europe, other countries'

cells in Europe than the zoomed country's cell are out of the screen. That is, Strasnick only displays a relation between cells directly connected by connectors 210.

Applicants fail to find in Strasnick any teaching or suggestion to display cells having a similar level of linkage position, such as the Europe, America and Asia cells, or all countries' cells in Europe, on a screen together.

In contrast, an object of the present invention is, for example, to display the Europe cell together with the America and Asia cells mutually on a screen, and on zooming to countries' cells, to display all countries' cells in Europe mutually simultaneously on a screen.

Therefore, Claims 1, 110 and 115 are believed patentable over Strasnick.

Independent claims 5, 22 and 112 recite, inter alia, that time-series data items are displayed distinguishably between first and second data items.

The Office Action states that while time-series is not explicitly taught by Strasnick, it would have been obvious to use time series, as claimed.

However, as mentioned above, Strasnick which neither teaches nor suggests to display cells having the similar level of linkage position, such as the Europe, America and Asia cells or all countries' cells in Europe, on a screen, cannot display time-series data items in a time on a screen mutually simultaneously. That is, Strasnick does

not display time-series data items having a similar level of linkage position.

Therefore, independent Claims 5, 22 and 112 are believed to distinguish over Strasnick.

Claims 21, 35 and 115 recite, in addition to the feature of Claims 5, 22 and 112, respectively, discussed above, that a schedule table is displayed and data items associated with a desired time are displayed responsively to designation of said desired time on said schedule table.

Strasnick does not teach or suggest that data items associated with a desired time are displayed responsively to designation of the desired time on a schedule table.

Therefore, Claims 21, 35 and 115 are believed to distinguish over Strasnick.

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as a reference against the independent claims herein. Those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may

be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 758-2400 or by facsimile at (212) 758-2982. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph W. Pagura  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 38,586

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
277 Park Avenue  
New York, New York 10172

F502\A586363\wjm